

## Comparison of MSIP Standards & Procedures: Second Cycle vs. Third Cycle

**Note:** The “Third Cycle” standards and procedures are scheduled to take effect for MSIP reviews beginning during the **2001-2002** school year. The second-cycle standards and procedures remain in effect for 2000-2001.

Second Cycle (Current)	Third Cycle (New)
1. Separate rating is given for each area of MSIP standards (Resource, Process and Performance). Overall district's accreditation rating is based on a combination of all three areas.	Three areas of standards are integrated. Final accreditation rating is based on an overall evaluation and one total score. Minimum Performance requirements are defined for each level (accredited, provisional and unaccredited).
2. Academic progress is measured by 3% growth in top two levels and 3% decrease in bottom two levels of MAP scores. MMAT data used as secondary data in some cases.	New “Performance Index” recognizes progress at ALL levels of MAP. “3% method” also may be used. Achievement data will be analyzed both ways for district's maximum benefit. No MMAT data is used.
3. 5 academic measures; 11 total performance measures.	7 academic measures; 13 total performance measures.
4. ACT scores are used to measure college-prep effectiveness. “Completers” are used as measure of participation in vocational courses. Use of these different measures makes comparisons difficult.	College and vocational preparation will be evaluated based on similar measures: number of students $\times$ number of credits taken, compared to number of juniors and seniors and total credit hours available.
5. Districts are not recognized for closing achievement gaps or for making progress below specified MAP achievement “floors.”	Points are available for closing achievement gaps and for making progress below the MAP achievement floors.
6. Limited methods for analyzing student and district performance are available. On several measures, districts may be adversely affected by one year of unusually high or low performance.	Multiple options are available for evaluating district performance over time: annual gains, rolling average, multi-year average compared to base year, etc.
7. No allowances are made for districts that may be affected by student mobility or students' limited English proficiency.	Districts have an opportunity to appeal achievement results that may be affected by mobility or low English proficiency.
8. “Accredited with Distinction” status (for improvement or high performance) is only possible once every 5 years.	Districts may earn annual “Distinction” rating based on performance.

9. Some waivers of evaluation are available for A+ Schools; a waiver of the on-site MSIP review is not available for districts.	High-performing districts may qualify for a waiver of a full on-site MSIP review.
10. Some data (such as attendance) must be provided by districts at the time of a MSIP review, increasing the data-collection burden.	More district data will be available from automated sources (Core Data, ACT, MAP). Districts had a one-time opportunity to update/correct Core Data history. Data-collection burden is reduced.
11. Resource and Process Standards viewed as “effective practices” and not necessarily linked to student achievement. Substantial paperwork is needed to document compliance with the Process Standards and Indicators.	Process Standards are integrated and tied more closely to student performance. Districts will be required to document fewer Process Standards and Indicators.
12. Students with disabilities are not required to take MMATs.	Performance of students with disabilities is recorded through standard MAP reports. “Level not determined” students may not exceed 10%. Alternative MAP (“MAP-A”) is now available for students with disabilities.
13. Elementary (K-8) districts must monitor honor roll and dropout status of their high school students. Neither measure contributes significantly to overall accreditation status.	Honor roll and dropout standards eliminated for K-8 districts; data-collection burden is reduced.
14. District self-study report, required prior to the on-site MSIP review, is time and labor intensive.	Self-study is eliminated. Districts will complete approximately 15 basic forms and 15 narrative “responses.” Paperwork is reduced.
15. Extensive “documentation files” are required, causing a substantial paperwork load for district personnel.	Documentation is greatly reduced. The on-site review team will review only about 44 specified items or documents.
16. Self-study process and compilation of documentation files require excessive staff time during the school day.	Out-of-class time for teachers and time demands on other personnel should be greatly reduced by revised procedures.